UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,216	09/22/2005	Kci Karasawa	277747US90PCT	1366
	7590 10/23/200 AK, MCCLELLAND I	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE ST	REET	LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2439		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/23/2008	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/550,216	KARASAWA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Christian LaForgia	2439		

	Christian LaForgia	2439	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 10 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07()	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a d			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inplication (i	102 02 1/.
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-18. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>13. ☐ Other:</li> </ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Christian LaForgia/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2439	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that the prior art references do not teach making a determination if an agreement is necessary. The Examiner disagrees. As noted by the Applicant the cited section discloses a set-top box receiving ECM messages and decryption keys. The Examiner holds that this serves as an indication of the necessity of the agreement. As reference states, the decryption keys are applied to the encrypted content, therefore some type of agreement must exist for the appropriate set top box to receive the appropriate key. The is further expanded upon in the references statement that unencrypted data is allowed to pass freely through the set-top box. Therefore, the prior art reference implicitly discloses determining the necessity of an agreement and the rejection is proper.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).